Persons nominated to the University Senate.

Q.—112. **Sri S. SRINIVASA IYENGAR** (T. Narsipur).—

Will the Government be pleased to state :—

(*a*) how many persons were nominated to the University Senate recently constituted ;

(*b*) the names of these persons and their qualifications ;

(*c*) whether it is not a fact that all these persons that are nominated belong to the Congress Party ?

A.—**Sri A. G. RAMACHANDRA RAO** (Minister for Law and Education).—

(*a*) Eleven.

(*b*) Sriyuths—

(1) A. Bheemappa Naik, B.A.
(2) G. A. Thimmappa Gowda, B.Sc., LL.B.
(3) G. Javali, B.A., LL.B.
*(4) Kondajji Basappa, B.Sc., LL.B.
(5) M. Madiah.
(6) Syed Abdur Rahman, B.A., B.L.
(7) K. Y. Mylar Setty, B.A., B.Com.
(8) Ramanarayan Chellaram, B.A.
(9) V. M. Mascarenhas, B.A.
(10) G. Narayana Gowda, B.A.
(11) N. Hutchmasthy Gowda, B.A.

(*c*) No.

Sri S. SRINIVASA IYENGAR—Will the Government be pleased to state how many of them belong to the Congress Party ?

Sri A. G. RAMACHANDRA RAO.—No. Government are not aware.

Sri S. SRINIVASA IYENGAR.—Is it not a fact that all of them are Congressmen ?

Sri A. G. RAMACHANDRA RAO.—No. I challenge the insinuation.

Sri S. SRINIVASA IYENGAR.—When were the elections to the Senate completed ? Is it correct if I put it to Government that the nominations were done nine months after the elections ?

Sri A. G. RAMACHANDRA RAO.—I cannot say. There was some delay, as I said the other day.

Sri S. SRINIVASA IYENGAR.—What are the reasons for such inordinate delay ?

Sri A. G. RAMACHANDRA RAO.—It was under consideration.

Sri S. SRINIVASA IYENGAR.—Is it not a fact that the list now before us was dictated by the Congress Party ?

Sri A. G. RAMACHANDRA RAO.—I repudiate the insinuation.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Question hour is over.

Questions for Answer on the day.

(But not taken up)

Q.—209. **Sri H. S. RUDRAPPA** (Honnali).—

Will the Government be pleased to state :—

(*a*) the quantity of foodgrains they intend to import for the year 1953-54 ;

(*b*) the landing costs of importing foodgrains ;

(*c*) the amount of loss they will incur at the present selling rates ;

(*d*) the amount of loss they will incurr if the selling prices of millets are reduced to 3½ seers per rupee ?

A.—**Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA** (Minister for Home and Industries).—

(*a*) During the Calendar Year 1953, it is proposed to import 20,000 tons rice, 40,000 tons wheat and wheat products and 1,20,000 tons millets.

(*b*) Landing cost depends on the source of supply. With reference to imports of jowar now obtained and the rates at which they are now imported, the cost will be as follows :—

Rs. 76-10-11 per palla of overseas rice imports.
Rs. 54-1-10 per palla of wheat.
Rs. 41-5-4 per palla of jowar.

(*c*) No loss in the case of wheat. Rs. 8 per palla in the case of jowar.

* Sri Kondajji Basappa has expressed his inability to accept the nomination.

(SRI H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.)

The loss of Rs. 10-0-3 per palla in the case of imported rice is set off by the margin available in the issue price over local procurement price.

(*d*) Rs. 12-12-2 per palla of jowar now imported.

Adjournment Motion *re* Police shooting at K.G.F.

Mr. SPEAKER.—On the 9th instant, several Hon'ble Members spoke about the admissibility of the adjournment motion of which notice has been given by Sri J. Mohamed Imam and Sri S. Srinivasa Iyengar. For the convenience of the Hon'ble Members I will read the motion again. It is as follows:

> "That this House do stand adjourned to raise a debate on a definite matter of urgent public importance and of recent occurrence namely the recent shooting by the Police at K.G.F. resulting in several casualities."

I have given deep consideration to the several points urged in favour of holding that a *prima facie* case for admitting this motion has been made out. But I have come to the conclusion that the motion is not in order.

With the advent of Responsible Government it has become necessary for not to consider an adjournment motion as an ordinary or a routine method of introducing a subject for debate and thus interrupting the appointed programme of business. This aspect of the matter has been dealt with by the Speaker of the Constituent Assembly of India when functioning as the Indian Legislature, in what is known as Mir Laik Ali Case. I have asked the Secretary to get relevant extracts from that ruling printed and circulated to Hon'ble Members. It has there been stated that "since the Ministry is now fully responsible to the House and members have now ample opportunities of discussing various matters, any impression that an adjournment motion continues to be a normal device for raising a discussion on any important matter as in the past would be incorrect." I might also refer to a ruling of the Speaker of the Bombay Legislative Assembly on the 19th January 1938 wherein it has been stated that "the principle of the fixity of the day's programme has to be considered to be at least as important if not more important than the right to move an adjournment motion and it is in this conflict of two principles that admissibility of an adjournment motion has to be considered." Finally I would invite attention to the ruling of the President of the Indian Legislative Assembly given on 16th July 1930, which is as follows:

> "Motions for adjournment are meant for obtaining an immediate debate on grave and serious matters which cannot otherwise be immediately and effectively dealt with and the very object of such motions will be lost if they are permitted to assume the character of an ordinary course of action of every day occurrence."

In the present case it is possible that the subject of the adjournment motion could be debated during the ordinary parliamentary opportunities available to members and such being the case, there appears to be no need to upset the day's business to take up this question on an adjournment motion. It is not as if the debate will brook no delay. The shooting took place some days ago. Any delay of a few hours or days in discussing the subject will not interfere with the fair debate of the question, nor will it result in worsening of the existing situation. There is thus no urgency within the technical meaning of our rules.

One other well-understood limitation on the right to move an adjournment motion is that the subject matter must involve more than ordinary administration of law. In the present case, from what could be gathered from the speeches of the members and otherwise, the facts appear to be that a Prohibitory Order was passed and it is alleged that it was defied. And it is further alleged that in the maintenance of law